

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

Application No.: 09/963,435	§	Examiner: Chankong, Dohm
Filed: September 27, 2001	§	Group/Art Unit: 2152
Inventor:	§	Atty. Dkt. No: 5681-78901
Daniel Blaukopf, et al.	§	
	§	
	§	
	§	
Title: Method and Protocol for	§	
Mediating Communication	§	
between Software and	§	
Applications	§	
	§	
	§	
	§	

SUPPLEMENTAL REPLY BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This supplemental reply brief is submitted in response to the Examiner's Answer dated January 30, 2007. Appellant respectfully requests that this Supplemental Reply Brief be entered pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 41.41 and considered by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences.

REPLY TO EXAMINER'S ANSWER

Appellants filed an Appeal Brief on March 13, 2006. On June 5, 2006, the Examiner issued an Examiner's Answer. In response, Appellants filed a Reply Brief on July 3, 2006. On October 16, 2006, the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences issued an Order Returning Undocketed Appeal to Examiner due to matters of conferee signatures and consideration of Information Disclosure Statements (IDS). On January 30, 2007, the Examiner issued a revised Examiner's Answer to address the issues from the Order Returning Undocketed Appeal to Examiner. The revised Examiner's Answer is largely a duplicate of the previous Examiner's Answer of June 5, 2006. Other than addressing the above-mentioned issues, the January 30, 2007 Examiner's Answer does not include any additional arguments or grounds of rejection. As such, Appellants' July 3, 2006 Reply Brief addresses and fully rebuts the Examiner's rejections and arguments stated in the revised Examiner's Answer. Appellants' July 3, 2006 Reply Brief is herein incorporated by reference in its entirety. As shown in detail in Appellants' Appeal Brief and Reply Briefs, the Examiner has clearly failed to establish a *prima facie* rejection of claims 1-20.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons submitted in the Appeal Brief, the July 3, 2006 Reply Brief and this Supplemental Reply Brief, it is submitted that the Examiner's rejections of claims 1-20 are erroneous. Reversal of the Examiner's decision is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees that may be due to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-78901/RCK. This Supplemental Reply Brief is submitted with a return receipt postcard.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert C. Kowert/

Robert C. Kowert, Reg. #39,255
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: March 30, 2007